

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 12, 14, 17 and 20-29 are pending in the application. The Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and withdraw the various objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities relating to the subject matter of Claim 9. Based on the cancellation of Claim 9, this objection to the drawings has been addressed and overcome without need to file amended or revised drawings. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings and indicate approval of the drawings of record.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The Examiner objected to the disclosure in view of a certain typographical error in Paragraph 16. Applicant has presented an amended version of Paragraph 16 which addresses and overcomes the objection to the Specification.

CLAIM OBJECTION

The Examiner objected to Claim 11 because of a minor informality. Based on cancellation of Claim 11, this objection has been addressed and the Examiner is kindly requested to withdraw this claim objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These rejections are traversed.

The Applicant has cancelled Claims 9 and 19. As such, the § 112, first paragraph, rejection has been addressed and rendered moot.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. This rejection is traversed.

The Applicant has amended Claim 12 in a manner which addresses and overcomes the rejection. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and withdraw this particular rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaoka (JP-200/283238A). This rejection is traversed.

Regarding independent Claim 1, the Applicant has amended this claim to include the limitation of objected Claim 4 and intervening Claim 3, both of which are now cancelled. As such, independent Claim 1, as amended, recites a combination of elements that is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Yamaoka reference alone or in combination with any other prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider the rejection and indicate allowance of independent Claim 1 and its remaining dependent Claims 2, 5 and 6.

Regarding independent Claim 7, the Applicant has amended this claim to include the limitations of objected Claim 11 and intervening Claims 8 and 10, all of which are

now cancelled. As such, independent Claim 7, as amended, recites a combination of elements that is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Yamaoka reference alone or in combination with any other prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider the rejection and indicate allowance of independent Claim 7 and its remaining dependent Claim 12.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of the Yamaoka reference and U.S. Patent No. 3,680,608 to Emmerich. In view of cancellation of Claims 3 and 13, this basis for rejection has been rendered moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicated that Claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. In this regard, new independent Claim 22 is presented for examination. Independent Claim 22 is a combination of objected Claim 16 with rejected independent Claim 7 and further including the subject matter of intervening dependent Claims 13 and 15. Accordingly, new independent Claim 22 and its dependent Claims 14, 17, 23 and 24 are now in condition for allowance.

Likewise, the Examiner indicated that Claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. In this regard, new independent Claim 25 is presented for examination. Independent Claim 25 is a combination of objected Claim 18 with rejected independent Claim 7 and further including the subject matter of intervening dependent

Claims 13 and 15. Accordingly, new independent Claim 25 and its dependent Claims 20, 21 and 25-29 are now considered to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1240.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2008

By: /Philip E. Rettig/
Philip E. Rettig, Reg. No. 34,000

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

PER/lkb